JONATHAN ACKER SHAPIRO (SBN 257199)	
JShapiro@goodwinlaw.com GOODWIN PROCTER LLP	
3 Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111	
Tel.: 415.733.6202 Fax: 415.276.3064	
NICOLE L. CHESSARI (SBN 259970)	
NChessari@goodwinlaw.com GOODWIN PROCTER LLP	
601 Marshall Street Redwood City, CA 94063	
Tel.: 650.752.3100 Fax: 650.853.1038	
ROBERT TIEFENBRUN (SBN 310975)	
RTiefenbrun@goodwinlaw.com GOODWIN PROCTER LLP	
601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 4100 Los Angeles, CA 90017	
Tel.: 213.426.2500 Fax: 213.623.1673	
Attorneys for Defendant CHRISTOPHER COOPER	
[ADDITIONAL COUNSEL ON SIGNATURE PAGE]	
UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRI	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLANI	DIVISION
STEPHEN ROSSI, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. 4:24-cv-01674-HSG
Plaintiffs,	TOTAL CAMPAIN ATTOM AND ODDED (1
V.	JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER (I CONCERNING REMAND AND (II) TO STAY PROCEEDINGS
ANTHONY DECHELLIS, CHRISTOPHER COOPER, and MORGAN STANLEY & CO. LLC,	Courtroom: 2 (4th Floor) Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
Defendants.	
Detenuants.	1

- 1	
1	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12, Plaintiff Stephen Rossi ("Plaintiff") and Defendants
2	Anthony DeChellis, Christopher Cooper, and Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC (collectively,
3	"Defendants" and, together with Plaintiff, the "Parties"), by and through their undersigned
4	counsel, hereby stipulate as follows:
5	WHEREAS, on February 15, 2024, Plaintiff commenced this action against Defendants
6	by filing the Complaint (ECF No. 1-2) in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of
7	Santa Clara (the "State Court"), Case No. 24CV431200;
8	WHEREAS, on March 18, 2024, Defendants removed this action from State Court to this
9	Court (ECF No. 1);
10	WHEREAS, on March 27, 2024, Plaintiff filed an Administrative Motion To Consider
11	Whether Cases Should Be Related (No. 4:23-cv-02277-HSG, ECF No. 86) (the "Administrative
12	Motion"), which sought to have this case deem related to Stevenson v. Becker, No. 4:23-cv-
13	02277-HSG (N.D. Cal.) ("Stevenson"), and Rossi v. Becker, No. 4:23-cv-02335-HSG (N.D. Cal.)
14	("Rossi I") and reassigned to this Court;
15	WHEREAS, on April 11, 2024, the Court issued an order deeming this action related to
16	Stevenson, and reassigned the action to this Court (ECF No. 19);
17	WHEREAS, on March 25, 2024, the Parties filed a Joint Stipulation to Extend Time to
18	Respond to the Complaint (ECF No. 14), which extended Defendants' time to respond to the
19	Complaint pending a decision on Plaintiff's then-forthcoming Administrative Motion;
20	WHEREAS, plaintiffs in Stevenson and Rossi I filed motions to remand those actions to
21	the State Court, (the "Remand Motions"), and the Parties to the Stevenson and Rossi I actions
22	briefed and argued those motions to remand before the Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
23	(Stevenson, ECF. Nos. 56, 66, 70, 77; Rossi I, ECF. Nos. 39, 49, 50, 57);
24	WHEREAS, on March 28, 2024, this Court denied the Remand Motions (No. 4:23-cv-
25	02277-HSG, at ECF No. 87; No. 4:23-cv-02335-HSG, at ECF No. 60, the "March 28 Order") and
26	further held that "the interests of clarity would be best served by definitive guidance from the
27	Ninth Circuit as to the recurring legal question of whether Section 22(a) of the 1933 Securities
28	2
- 1	IOINT STIPLIL ATION AND ODDED (I) CONCEDNING DEMAND AND (II) TO

1	Act [("1933 Act")] bars removal of even actions 'related to' a bankruptcy action pursuant to
2	Section 1452(a)," and thus directed the Parties to the <i>Stevenson</i> and <i>Rossi I</i> actions to submit a
3	stipulation and proposed order certifying an interlocutory appeal of the March 28 Order to the
4	U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) (the "Interlocutory
5	Appeal");
6	WHEREAS, Plaintiff believes remand of this action to State Court is appropriate on the
7	same bases set forth in the Remand Motions, and Defendants oppose remand;
8	WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Defendants agree that the March 28 Order shall be
9	determinative of whether this action is remanded to the State Court unless the March 28 Order is
10	reversed, vacated, or modified by the Interlocutory Appeal in which case the determination of the
11	remand issue by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Interlocutory Appeal shall
12	be determinative of whether this action is remanded to the State Court;
13	WHEREAS, on April 11, 2024, pursuant to stipulation, the Court ordered that, upon a
14	ruling relating this action to the <i>Stevenson</i> and <i>Rossi I</i> actions that the parties to this action shall
15	submit a stipulation, subject to Court approval, staying the proceedings in this case pending
16	determination of the Interlocutory Appeal (ECF No. 22);
17	WHEREAS, the Parties agree that staying the proceedings in this action pending the
18	resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal will best serve the interests of judicial
19	economy, conservation of time and resources, and orderly management of this action;
20	WHEREAS, the Parties previously stipulated to one extension of Defendants' time to
21	respond to the Complaint pending a decision on the Administrative Motion; the Parties do not
22	enter into this stipulation for the purpose of delay, and the Court has not yet scheduled any pre-
23	trial or trial dates; and
24	WHEREAS, no party will be prejudiced by this stipulated stay.
25	NOW THEREFORE, the Parties hereby stipulate and agree as follows:
26	1. The March 28 Order shall be binding on the Parties with respect to, and
27	determinative of, whether this action shall be remanded to the State Court, unless the March 28
- 1	

Order is reversed, vacated, or modified by the Interlocutory Appeal, in which case the determination of the remand issue by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the Interlocutory Appeal shall be determinative of whether this action is remanded to the State Court.

- 2. The proceedings in district court in this action will be stayed pending the resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal, no Defendant shall have any obligation to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint prior to resolution of the forthcoming Interlocutory Appeal and a schedule is thereafter set for Defendants to respond, and all other deadlines in this action shall be adjourned *sine die* pending resolution of the Interlocutory Appeal. This Stipulation is entered into without prejudice to any party seeking any interim relief.
- 3. Nothing in this Stipulation shall be construed as a waiver of any of Defendants' rights or positions in law or equity, or as a waiver of any defenses, except as to sufficiency of service of process, that Defendants would otherwise have, including, without limitation, jurisdictional defenses.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Case 4:24-cv-01674-HSG Document 39 Filed 04/16/24 Page 5 of 7

1	Dated: April 16, 2024 Respe	ectfully submitted,
2	GOO	DWIN PROCTER LLP
3	3	
4		/s/ Nicole L. Chessari
5	5	NICOLE L. CHESSARI (SBN 259970) NChessari@goodwinlaw.com 601 Marshall Street
6 7		Redwood City, CA 94063 Tel.: 650.752.3100 Fax: 650.853.1038
8		
9		JONATHAN ACKER SHAPIRO (SBN 257199)
10		JShapiro@goodwinlaw.com 3 Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111
11		Tel.: 415.733.6202 Fax: 415.276.3064
12	III	ROBERT TIEFENBRUN (SBN 310975)
13	3	RTiefenbrun@goodwinlaw.com 601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 4100
14	 	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel.: 213.426.2500
15		Fax: 213.623.1673
16	5	Attorneys for Defendant Christopher Cooper
17	7	
18	BRAU	UN HAGEY & BORDEN LLP
19		/s/ Michael S. Palmieri
20)	Ellen Leonida (SBN 184194)
21		Andrew Levine (SBN 278246) Andre Fontana (SBN 324801)
22	2	351 California Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, California 94104
23	3	Tel.: 415.599.0210 Email:leonida@braunhagey.com
24	ł	levine@braunhagey.com fontana@braunhagey.com
25	5	5,
26		
27		
28		5
	JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (AND (II) TO STAY PROCEEDINGS	(I) CONCERNING REMAND

JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER (I) CONCERNING REMAND AND (II) TO STAY PROCEEDINGS
CASE NO. 4:21-cv-07340-HSG

Case 4:24-cv-01674-HSG Document 39 Filed 04/16/24 Page 6 of 7

1	Jason C. Rubinstein (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>) Michael S. Palmieri (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>)
2	Dania Bardavid (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>) FRIEDMAN KAPLAN SEIILER
3	ADELMAN & ROBBINS LLP
4	7 Times Square New York, New York 10036
5	Tel: 212.833.1100 Email: jrubinstein@fklaw.com
6	mpalmieri@fklaw.com dbardavid@fklaw.com
7	Attorneys for Defendant Anthony DeChellis
8	
9	SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP
10	By: /s/ Daniel Lewis
11	Adam Hakki (appearance pro hac vice)
12	Daniel Lewis (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>) Joshua Ebersole (appearance <i>pro hac vice</i>)
13	599 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022
14	Tel.: 212.848.4000 Fax: 212.848.7179
15	Email: adam.hakki@shearman.com daniel.lewis@shearman.com joshua.ebersole@sheaman.com
16	Daniel H.R. Laguardia (SBN 314654)
17	140 New Montgomery Street, 10th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2997
18	Tel.: 415.616.1100 Fax: 415.616.1199
19	Email: daniel.laguardia@shearman.com
20	Attomony for Defendant Mongan Stanlan & Co
21	Attorneys for Defendant Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	6
	JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER (I) CONCERNING REMAND AND (II) TO STAY PROCEEDINGS

1		
2		
3		By: <u>/s/ Sean Greene</u>
		Adam E. Polk (SBN 273000)
4		apolk@girardsharp.com Sean Greene (SBN 328718)
5		sgreene@girardsharp.com
6		GIRARD SHARP LLP
		601 California Street, Suite 1400 San Francisco, CA 94108
7		Telephone: (415) 981-4800
8		Facsimile: (415) 981-4846
9		David W. Hall (SBN 274921)
10		dhall@hallfirmltd.com Armen Zohrabian (SBN 230492)
11		azohrabian@hallfirmltd.com
11		THE HALL FIRM, LTD.
12		Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
13		San Francisco, CA 94104
		Telephone: (415) 766-3534 Facsimile: (415) 402-0058
14		
15		Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephen Rossi
16		
17	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS	S SO ORDERED:
18		
19		Haywood S. Iell J.
20		HONORABLE HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		7
	JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER (I) CONC STAY PROCEEDINGS	

CASE NO. 4:21-cv-07340-HSG